Resk

# THE JOURNAL OF EDUCATIONAL OF EDUCATION AL OF MICHIGAN SOCIOLOGY FEB 5 1954

PERIODICAL READING ROOM

Social Work and Education (Some Interlearnings)	193
Sociology and Education for Social Work	196
Group Work Education — Education for What  Morris L. Eisentstein	205
Democratic Group Self-Determination	214
A Note on the Spatial and Social Pattern of a Small Discussion Group	222
Intensive Interviewing in Community Research	225
Uncontrolled Observation as a Source of Research Data	231
Collaboration of Social Scientists and Social Practitioners in the Solution of Social Problems	
Robert Cuba Jones	235

JANUARY 1954

# THE JOURNAL OF EDUCATIONAL SOCIOLOGY

## PUBLISHED BY

THE PAYNE EDUCATIONAL SOCIOLOGY FOUNDATION, INCORPORATED 157 WEST 13TH ST., NEW YORK 11, N.Y.

# Editorial Staff

DAN W. DODSON, Editor in Chief
JOHN C. PAYNE, Asst. Managing Editor
ABRAHAM I. KATSH, Managing Editor
GLADYS MARKIN, Asst. Managing Editor
EVELYN F. DODSON, Business Manager

HARVEY W. ZORBAUGH, FREDERIC M. THRASHER, STEPHEN G. RICH I. DAVID SATLOW, STEPHEN J. WRIGHT, ESTHER HILTON, ETHEL ALPENFELS, Associate Editors.

# Permanent Department

# **Book Reviews**

THE PAYNE EDUCATIONAL SOCIOLOGY FOUNDATION, INCORPORATED

# Board of Trustees

MAURICE MOFFATT, President
W. CLINTON STUART, Vice-President
HENRY W. MEISSNER, Secretary
I. DAVID SATLOW, Treasurer

DAN W. DODSON, Managing Trustee STEPHEN G. RICH WILLIAM W. BRICKMAN HERBERT D. HARPER

THE JOURNAL OF EDUCATIONAL SOCIOLOGY is published by The Payne Educational Sociology Foundation, Inc., monthly from September to May, inclusive. Publication and business office, 157 West 13th St., New York 11, N. Y. The subscription price is \$3.00 per year; foreign rates, Canadian and South American, \$3.25, all others, \$3.40; the price of single copies is 35 cents each. Orders for less than half a year will be charged at the single-copy rate.

Entered as second-class matter September 27, 1934, at the Post Office at New York, N.Y., under the Act of March 3, 1879. Additional entry at the Post Office at Manchester, N. H., authorized January 16, 1950.

THE JOURNAL OF EDUCATIONAL SOCIOLOGY is indexed in Educational Index, Public Affairs Information Service, and Business Education Index.

The publishers of The Journal of Educational Sociology are not responsible for the views held by its contributors.

PRINTED IN U.S.A.

# THE JOURNAL OF EDUCATIONAL SOCIOLOGY

A Magazine of Theory and Practice

Vol. 27

January, 1954

No. 5

# SOCIAL WORK AND EDUCATION

(Some Interlearnings)

This issue presents several selected papers dealing with social work and social group work developments and thought. It was the thought, in devoting the entire issue to this topic, that there were many common facets of experience which the papers offer to both professions. It cannot be denied that the entirety of education is moving toward interdisciplinary patterns today. The learnings which these two professions offer each other should be a contribution to this development.

Some comparisons indicate the extent of this common concern:

1) Both require competencies gleaned from numerous academic disciplines.

2) Both are interested in how to work with people to encourage growth and development of total personalities into their fullest stature.

3) Both have enormous responsibilities to the public for dealing with populations where the state has a direct equity.

4) As practitioners, both are still in the process of defining their fields of operation.

Prof. Mulligan's article traces the growth of the profession. It shows how the relation between social work as a profession and sociology as an academic discipline has been spelled out. It poses many questions which are as yet unsolved, as to how much sociology should go into the training of social workers, and whether it should be done in the school of social work or in the sociology department. This is not a problem unique to social work. It is very prominent as a concern in teacher training. It would be very illuminating to have similar histories of the relation between social work and psychology. It would undoubtedly show that while education went off the "deep end" on educational psychology in its earlier develop-

Copyright 1954, by the Payne Educational Sociology Foundation, Inc.

ment, social work went with Freud. Both were individualistic and the sterility of both diversions have now become apparent, if they are taken out of a total interdisciplinary configuration.

Eisenstein article raises questions concerning the goals of professional group work education. In clear tones he limnes the problem which is the plague of both groups; "How do you produce competencies in professional people which transcends the 'tricks of the trade' and distinguishes them as truly professional?" If social group workers are nothing more than good recreation leaders, etc., they may as well be trained in a physical education department of a school of education. The educator would say that if they were simply technicians they should, perhaps, learn their dancing skill at Arthur Murray's and their game skills at the Y.M.C.A.

The remainder of the articles deal with aspects of group work and with field work. The largest gap in the material is perhaps that which relates to community organization. In as much as the next number of The Journal of Educational Sociology deals with this problem in teacher training, some readers will perhaps seek that issue out for further reading.

As one surveys the relationship of the two professions there are many problems with which we should be jointly concerned. Some of them would include:

- 1) Can we improve our communication with each other? Slavin pointed out how necessary this is last year. Mira Talbott likewise indicated the problem it presents in working with children referred to the Bureau of Child Guidance in New York City. This problem of communication is a major one in work involving integration of disciplines.
- 2) Both groups are moving toward a balance between individualistic approaches and those involving group practices.
- 3) Both groups seem to be moving toward a consideration of total community as a basis of operation. One of the difficulties now being presented is the large number of students who are seeking agency assistance with their curriculum. Some are seeking a "community experience" as a basis of growth in their academic work.
- 4) Both are realizing that traditional field work experiences are not enough to assure professional growth. The social work trainee in the agency and the pre-professional teacher in the classroom as a practice teacher cannot be expected to develop professionally by working in the school-agency and have a supervisor come around

occasionally to find out how the school-agency personnel think he is getting along. In the old pattern of apprentice training the pupil worked at the bench alongside the mentor to learn the trade. Today the mentors of both groups expect the student to work at the bench with some one else. He (the mentor) prefers to profess from the ivory tower.

- 5) Both professions have a long way to go in the development of adequate criteria of evaluation. Competency has little relation to capacity to master subject matter.
- 6) Both have great need for research skills in working with other professionals. Team work has not been a significant part of the training of either group to the present time. As both professions go deeper into community organization and participation, as undoubtedly they will, the finest skills of group work process will be needed to keep frictions between the two groups from limiting the effectiveness of both.

It is hoped that this number will stimulate a "community of thinking" on what is our "community of interest."

Dan W. Dodson.

# SOCIOLOGY AND EDUCATION FOR SOCIAL WORK

# Raymond A. Mulligan

In the last few years there appears to have developed a renewed interest on the part of sociologists in the field of social work. This rapprochement has manifested itself in the re-establishment of the section on sociology and social work in the American Sociological Society, and in the appearance of several articles written around the theme of social work and social science in various sociological journals.

The interest of sociologists in social work should be more than superficial when it is considered that: (1) A number of departments of sociology offer courses with social work content on the undergraduate level or are strongly oriented toward preparation for careers in social work; (2) several introductory sociology textbooks implicitly or explicitly imply that a major in sociology is adequate training for certain types of social work positions; (3) certain sociologists erroneously claim that social work is applied sociology; and (4) one of the five categories into which the occupations of members of the American Sociological Society are divided is that of social work.

In light of the above relationships it may be of some general interest to the profession for the writer to present a survey of the development of education for social work in the United States with some emphasis on social change, the social processes, and the historical and present interest of sociologists in the field.

## TRAINING FOR SOCIAL WORK

Practice precedes theory in the growth of a profession, and a close relationship continues between the two as the profession develops. It would be expected, therefore, that formal education for social work in its beginnings to be closely attuned to the needs of social work agencies. Before the beginning of the twentieth century opportunities for professional training in social work were nil, and apprenticeship was the usual method of introducing new workers to the field. Apprenticed visitors began by watching older workers, talking to executives, and by attending conferences. Later a few

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup>See J. L. Gillin and J. P. Gillin, Cultural Sociology, N. Y., 1948; P. Landis, Man in Environment, N. Y., 1949; J. Roucek and R. Warren, Sociology, Ames, Iowa, 1951; E. Schuler, et al., Outside Readings in Sociology, N. Y., 1952; and R. Sutherlands, et al., Introductory Sociology, N. Y., 1952.

agencies began to arrange lectures and courses in reading for their new workers.

The first step away from apprenticeship came in the summer of 1898 when the New York Charity Organization Society held a six weeks' training course for social workers already in the field. By 1903 the training program was increased to a six months' winter session with weekly lectures at a late afternoon hour. In 1904 these experimental classes developed into the New York School of Philanthropy (now developed into the New York School of Social Work of Columbia University) with a full year's course of training primarily for students without experience in social work. Similar schools were established by family, child welfare, and other casework agencies in Boston, Philadelphia, St. Louis, and elsewhere. However, these schools were still largely apprenticeship training centers and their curricula reflected the philosophy of the private social work agencies supporting and controlling them.

The First World War gave rise to the establishment of additional schools of social work. Training courses for the preparation of personnel needed in the administration of services for the military and their families were given in a number of universities. Most of these institutions of higher learning had previously undertaken no practical preparation for social work. The American Red Cross not only sponsored the courses but also outlined the subject matter and supplemented the teaching personnel in order that the courses might be as uniform as possible. A number of these programs were of short duration while others prepared the way for the foundation of schools

of social work.

With the passage of time agency schools of social work either ceased functioning or became affiliated with institutions of higher learning. For a time, however, there were many social workers who felt that institutions of higher learning in conforming to the academic requirements for the granting of degrees might not recognize the professional value of field work and other technical courses. Although universities have willingly permitted affiliation, in a sense they have not fully recognized the academic content of the social work curriculum on the graduate level in terms of hours and credits. This becomes evident when one compares the number of hours required for the master's degree in schools of social work with the number of hours required for academic and professional degrees in other fields.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup>See E. L. Brown, Social Work as a Profession, N. Y., 1935.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup>E. V. Hollis, "Social Work Education," Higher Education, 8 (May 15, 1952), pp. 207-211.

Once the universities incorporated the schools, first in departments or divisions, then in independent professional schools, it might be said that education for social work had passed an important stage.<sup>4</sup>

Schools of social work in their early affiliations with universities sometimes became organizations within departments of sociology or were attached thereto for administrative purposes. As late as 1930 this relationship still survived to the extent that more than one-third of the member schools of the American Association of Schools of Social Work were headed by sociologists and three of the schools had the word "sociology" in their titles.<sup>5</sup>

# THE AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF SCHOOLS OF SOCIAL WORK

By 1918 professional growth in the field of social work could be measured by: (1) The number of schools of social work; (2) the number of professional social work organizations; (3) a concern for standards and methods; and (4) the development of a basic philosophy and method of social work.

In 1919 seventeen schools of social work banded together and formed the Association of Training Schools for Professional Social Work (later the American Association of Schools of Social Work). Subsequently, in 1924, the Association required new member schools to have an administrator, an organized curriculum, and to be affiliated with a university. The curriculum in some schools at this time was of one year duration and on the undergraduate level while other schools had two-year programs, some of which required the bachelor's degree for admission.<sup>6</sup>

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup>Ann King, "Education for Social Work," Social Work Year Book 1947, N. Y., 1947.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>8</sup>See I. F. Conrad, "Education for Social Work," Social Work Year Book 1929, N. Y., 1930, p. 151, for a list of the schools and the names of the directors. The writer was able to identify the following directors as sociologists: H. W. Odum, E. E. Eubank, U. G. Weatherly, E. S. Bogardus, J. L. Gillin, E. S. Chapin, C. A. Dawson, A. E. Wood, J. E. Cutler, and M. J. Karpf. Other sociologists continued to head units or divisions for social work training until a much later date. For example, the late E. H. Sutherland was the Director of the Indiana University Training Course for Social Work, a unit for many years within the Department of Sociology, until 1944.

The schools with the word "sociology" in their titles were: Loyola University (Chicago), School of Sociology; University of Minnesota, Department of Sociology Training Course for Social and Civic Work; and Fordham University, School of Sociology and Social Service.

<sup>6</sup>E. V. Hollis, op. cit.

The first basic minimum curriculum was established in 1932 and had the purpose of establishing some uniformity as to what was being taught in the member schools, and of determining a basis of eligibility. At first this curriculum was required for new schools seeking admission to the Association, but by 1934 the standards were made applicable to both new schools and all member schools. In 1937 the Association made the requirement that all member schools should offer professional education only on the graduate level.

The decision of the Association, requiring all professional education in member schools to be offered on the graduate level, coincided with the expanding field of social welfare under the Social Security Act, and is said to have had the effect of divorcing social work edu-

cation from the majority of positions in the field.8

From 1939 to 1952, when the American Association of Schools of Schools of Social Work ceased to operate as a functioning organization and merged with the new Council on Social Work Education, the Association required the professional curriculum in member schools to be based on four years of undergraduate study in a liberal arts college. Two types of schools offering professional programs were recognized. Type I school provided a one-year curriculum on the graduate level including field work for which a professional certificate was issued; and Type II school offered a two-year curriculum on the graduate level for which the master's degree was granted. Type II schools were, also, permitted to offer study beyond the two-year course.

The most frequently found criteria used by member schools of the Association in recruiting and selecting students were: (1) Candidates for admission were holders of the bachelor's degree with a strong social science preparation; (2) the candidates had the capacity to do professional work on the graduate level; and (3) they also had the personal aptitude of working with people. The Association looked upon education for social work as a continuous process and felt that undergraduate and graduate education were supplementary and related.

# GRADUATE VERSUS UNDERGRADUATE TRAINING

Undergraduate education for social work has long been the concern of colleges and schools of social work. For schools of social work the problem was temporarily postponed by the decision of the Amer-

<sup>7</sup>A. King, op. cit.

<sup>8</sup>E. V. Hollis, op. cit.

ican Association of Schools of Social Work to limit its membership to schools whose work was entirely of a graduate nature. The question re-appeared, however, when social work agencies found themselves unable to attract trained social workers in sufficient numbers.

The problem of undergraduate training was intensified by the rapid expansion of social security, rural social welfare, and war service programs. The low requirements prescribed in many merit systems for beginning public welfare visitors and the number of vacancies in such positions impeded the recruiting programs of professional schools of social work.

The situation was ultimately reached where thousands of individuals were not only going into the field of social work without graduate training but with little or no undergraduate training; and in some cases without a college education. For example, as of 1950 only sixteen per cent of the 75,000 persons classified as social workers in the United States could be properly certified as trained social workers — having had completed the standard two-year graduate program. Twenty-four per cent had preparation that varied from a few credit hours on the graduate level to, but not including, two years. Twenty per cent had at least a college degree and the remaining 40 per cent had not even been graduated from college.

Taking cognizance of the limited number of professionally trained social workers being graduated from schools of social work and the tendency of trained social workers to avoid public welfare positions some educators argued that, at least as a temporary expedient, undergraduate training should be promoted and recognized as direct preparation for certain types of social work positions. Others pointed out that a good sociology or social science background for college students going directly into the field upon graduation might be of more value to the field in the long run than to blindly emphasize graduate training which had only succeeded in attracting relatively few students.

In the face of these developments the American Association of Schools of Social Work re-evaluated its position on education for social work. The re-evaluation led to successive modifications of the Association's program so that by 1945 it stood as an integrated plan of education with three progressive levels of education. The first, or undergraduate level, was one in which a student could acquire enough knowledge to enable him to be useful in a social serv-

<sup>\*\*</sup>ibid. Of the 40 per cent which had not been graduated from college, 25 per cent had high school or less education.

ice agency as an aide; the second level was represented by the first graduate year of a school of social work in which the basic preparation for social work is offered; and the third level was represented by the second year of graduate work in a school of social work which would enable the student to gain full professional training with an area of specialization.<sup>10</sup>

# THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF SCHOOLS OF SOCIAL ADMINISTRATION

The answer to the problem of insufficient numbers of trained social workers that was given by colleges outside of the membership of the American Association of Schools of Social Work was the plan to go back to a system of undergraduate education of instruction for social work training.

In 1938 a group representing the Association of Land-Grant Colleges and Universities, the National Association of State Universities, the Association of Urban Universities, and the Association of American Universities was formed. From this group emerged the National Association of Schools of Social Administration in 1942.

The purpose of the Association was to promote instruction for such fields as old age insurance, unemployment compensation, recreation, rural social work, personnel, and others. <sup>11</sup> The program offered in its member schools was chiefly undergraduate, but in some cases a year of graduate work was offered which led to the master's degree. The curriculum consisted of a combination of sociology, social science and social work courses and field work. The objective of the program was to prepare students to go immediately into the field of social work.

In 1944 the National Association of State Universities recognized the National Association of Schools of Social Administration as an accrediting agency in the field of social work. At a combined meeting of the American Association of Schools of Social Work and the National Association of Schools of Social Administration held in Cleveland in January, 1945, both organizations approved the degree of B. A. in social work. One of the recommendations growing out of this conference resulted in the organization of the National Coun-

<sup>11</sup>G. Hamilton, "Education for Social Work," Social Work Year Book 1945, N. Y., 1945.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>10</sup>A. F. Fenlason, "The Present Status of Education for Social Work in Institutions of Higher Learning in the United States," *American Sociological Review*, 10 (Oct., 1945), pp. 689-691.

cil on Education for Social Work to conduct a study of undergraduate education for social work.<sup>12</sup>

# THE NATIONAL COUNCIL ON SOCIAL WORK EDUCATION

The National Council on Social Work Education held its initial meeting in New York City in August, 1946, and was incorporated in January, 1948. The membership of the Council consisted of five representatives each from the American Association of Schools of Social Work, the National Association of Schools of Social Administration, the American Association of Social Workers, and the public services, and one each from the specialized professional services, the Joint Committee on Accrediting of the AASSW and NASSA, the Association of American Universities, the American Association of Colleges, and the National Social Welfare Association. Ten members at large were also represented. The purposes of this Council were to serve as a medium for groups interested in education for social work, to conduct a study of undergraduate and graduate education for social work, and to undertake other studies from time to time. In November, 1947, the Carnegie Corporation granted the Council \$31,000 for research.13

# THE COUNCIL ON SOCIAL WORK EDUCATION

The National Council on Social Work Education undertook as its first major project the study of social work education, which was made possible through the grant from the Carnegie Corporation. The report, "Social Work Education in the United States," grew out of this study. In May, 1952, a new Council on Social Work Education, re-organized according to the recommendations outlined in the report, was officially established. The new Council took the place of the National Council on Social Work Education, the American Association of Schools of Social Work, and the National Association of Schools of Social Administration. The National Council on Social Work Education merged with the new organization, and the AASSW and the NASSA both ceased to operate as functioning organizations.

13ibid.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>12</sup>See Pamphlet on the Purpose and Program of the NASSA, Grand Forks, North Dakota, 1948.

The new Council has four commissions: (1) On accrediting; (2) on program, planning and services, and publications; (3) on re-

search; (4) on schools and departments of social work.14

The Council has representatives from four groups: (1) Educational institutions, including both graduate schools of social work and undergraduate departments of sociology offering programs introductory to professional social work; (2) professional membership organizations of social workers; (3) public and private agencies in the field of social work; and (4) delegates-at-large representing higher education, other professions, and the general public.

The purpose of the undergraduate curriculum, according to the new Council, is to: (1) Prepare graduates for advanced professional education; (2) to include education in social welfare for students going into immediate employment with social welfare agencies which require only the bachelor's degree; and (3) to include social welfare education as part of the liberal arts education for students in

general.15

Undergraduate departments of sociology offering education for social welfare may be admitted for membership in the new Council if they meet the following requirements: (1) They must offer a well defined and integrated curriculum extending over at least two years — the curriculum must be designed to include social welfare content as a part of a general education program and is available to all students. (2) The sequence of courses in the junior and senior years involves a core of ten semester hours in social welfare content (social welfare content is construed to include such courses as social statistics, social legislation, the family, and juvenile delinquency, as well as fields of social work). (3) The curriculum is based on a foundation of general liberal arts education. And (4) payment of dues to the Council and a pledge to participate in the Council's meetings and activities.<sup>16</sup>

As of May, 1953, the Council includes sixty graduate schools of social work in universities throughout the United States and Canada and forty undergraduate departments, to a large extent sociology, administering undergraduate education for social welfare among American colleges and universities.<sup>17</sup>

15 Letter from the Council on Social Work Education, Ap 24, '53.

17 New York Times, May 3, 1953.

<sup>14</sup>M. C. Maxted, Undergraduate Social Work Education: Stepchild or Baby?, University of Arkansas, Fayetteville, Ark., 1952.

<sup>16&</sup>quot;Application for Constituent Membership" Council on Social Work Education, April 24, 1953.

cil on Education for Social Work to conduct a study of undergraduate education for social work.<sup>12</sup>

# THE NATIONAL COUNCIL ON SOCIAL WORK EDUCATION

The National Council on Social Work Education held its initial meeting in New York City in August, 1946, and was incorporated in January, 1948. The membership of the Council consisted of five representatives each from the American Association of Schools of Social Work, the National Association of Schools of Social Administration, the American Association of Social Workers, and the public services, and one each from the specialized professional services, the Joint Committee on Accrediting of the AASSW and NASSA, the Association of American Universities, the American Association of Colleges, and the National Social Welfare Association. Ten members at large were also represented. The purposes of this Council were to serve as a medium for groups interested in education for social work, to conduct a study of undergraduate and graduate education for social work, and to undertake other studies from time to time. In November, 1947, the Carnegie Corporation granted the Council \$31,000 for research.18

# THE COUNCIL ON SOCIAL WORK EDUCATION

The National Council on Social Work Education undertook as its first major project the study of social work education, which was made possible through the grant from the Carnegie Corporation. The report, "Social Work Education in the United States," grew out of this study. In May, 1952, a new Council on Social Work Education, re-organized according to the recommendations outlined in the report, was officially established. The new Council took the place of the National Council on Social Work Education, the American Association of Schools of Social Work, and the National Association of Schools of Social Administration. The National Council on Social Work Education merged with the new organization, and the AASSW and the NASSA both ceased to operate as functioning organizations.

13ibid.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>12</sup>See Pamphlet on the Purpose and Program of the NASSA, Grand Forks, North Dakota, 1948.

The new Council has four commissions: (1) On accrediting; (2) on program, planning and services, and publications; (3) on re-

search; (4) on schools and departments of social work.14

The Council has representatives from four groups: (1) Educational institutions, including both graduate schools of social work and undergraduate departments of sociology offering programs introductory to professional social work; (2) professional membership organizations of social workers; (3) public and private agencies in the field of social work; and (4) delegates-at-large representing higher education, other professions, and the general public.

The purpose of the undergraduate curriculum, according to the new Council, is to: (1) Prepare graduates for advanced professional education; (2) to include education in social welfare for students going into immediate employment with social welfare agencies which require only the bachelor's degree; and (3) to include social welfare education as part of the liberal arts education for students in

general.15

Undergraduate departments of sociology offering education for social welfare may be admitted for membership in the new Council if they meet the following requirements: (1) They must offer a well defined and integrated curriculum extending over at least two years — the curriculum must be designed to include social welfare content as a part of a general education program and is available to all students. (2) The sequence of courses in the junior and senior years involves a core of ten semester hours in social welfare content (social welfare content is construed to include such courses as social statistics, social legislation, the family, and juvenile delinquency, as well as fields of social work). (3) The curriculum is based on a foundation of general liberal arts education. And (4) payment of dues to the Council and a pledge to participate in the Council's meetings and activities.<sup>16</sup>

As of May, 1953, the Council includes sixty graduate schools of social work in universities throughout the United States and Canada and forty undergraduate departments, to a large extent sociology, administering undergraduate education for social welfare among American colleges and universities.<sup>17</sup>

<sup>15</sup>Letter from the Council on Social Work Education, Ap 24, '53.

<sup>14</sup>M. C. Maxted, Undergraduate Social Work Education: Stepchild or Baby?, University of Arkansas, Fayetteville, Ark., 1952.

<sup>16&</sup>quot;Application for Constituent Membership" Council on Social Work Education, April 24, 1953.

<sup>17</sup> New York Times, May 3, 1953.

In retrospect, it appears that social work education within the last fifty years has made much progress and has attained considerable maturity. This growth, although extensive and perhaps rapid, has not always been integrative. As a transmissible body of knowledge accumulated, training for the profession changed from apprenticeship to formal education. When the training program became so inflexible that it failed to adjust to social change and thus became ineffective in meeting group needs, the ingredients of a collective problem developed. Educational, professional, and national organizations banded together or aligned themselves in opposition to other similar groups in an effort to bring about changes in education for social work. Awareness of the problem was followed by a clash of interests over proposed solutions. Competition among the groups was followed by cooperation and accommodation.

Historically, there is an affinity between social work problems and sociology. At the turn of the present century many individuals were attracted to the study of sociology, and became sociologists, out of an interest in the solution of social work problems. In the last twenty-five years sociology has moved out of the realm of social welfare problems to an interest in sociological problems. It was thus logical that some of the early courses for social work education were offered in departments of sociology or in divisions that were administered by sociologists.

Today many of the colleges and universities offering undergraduate education for social work offer this training in departments of sociology. Part of the training consists of courses in sociology, social work, and social science. The sociology and social work courses are offered in sociology departments. In general persons with training and experience in social work offer the social work courses, as social work and sociology are distinct and non-interchangeable fields. Training in one field does not qualify one to function professionally or to teach in the other.

Raymond A. Mulligan is in the department of Sociology at the University of Arizona at Tucson.

# GROUP WORK EDUCATION - EDUCATION FOR WHAT?\*

# Morris L. Eisenstein

Since group work education is an integral part of social work education, I would like to consider the overall problem of social work education before focusing on the specific problems of group work. The underlying thesis of this paper is that social work education has to solve several problems. The first is to clarify whether we are training people for a profession or for a discipline. Second is to determine what are our fundamental goals; and third is to clarify our educational philosophy.

Social Work education for some time has been concerned with organizing itself for professional education, to train professionals in social work. The Hollis-Taylor study stemmed from a concern with the effectiveness of education up to the present and a desire to solve some of the knotty problems of past years which still plague us: should there be undergraduate training, what should be its content, what should its relationship be to graduate training, what should be the relationship between practice and theory or school and field work and many others. Enmeshed in all these questions is the problem of whether social work is to be a profession. In recent months a number of articles and addresses have appeared dealing with the problem and characteristics of professionalization. The nature of our work — whether a profession, semi-profession, craft, skill, technique or discipline, will determine the nature and extent of the educational experience required to qualfy for participating in it.

There is no question in my mind and I would guess in your mind, that social workers in the main consider themselves professionals and wish to be recognized as such. It should prove of interest, therefore, to deal with some of the concepts of professions which are be-

ing offered as a basis for professional education.

Let us examine the criteria for a profession as outlined in the Hollis-Taylor report especially since some people like Mr. Ernest B. Harper, Head of the Department of Social Service, Michigan State College, seem to be measuring time in social work education history as pre- and post-Hollis. The Report presents the following criteria:

<sup>\*</sup>Paper presented before the Rochester Chapter — A.A.G.W. May 2, 1952. <sup>1</sup>Ernest V. Hollis and Alice L. Taylor—Social Work Education in the U.S. (N.Y. Columbia University Press 1951—p. 109)

1. Does the profession have a well defined function, the nature and scope of which can be identified?

2. Does the profession have a philosophy, code of ethics and other means of self-regulation which assures that its practice transcends the bounds of political, sectarian and economic self-interest?

3. Does the profesion have a unified pattern of organization that

can speak for it with one voice?

4. Does the compensation received by the professional practitioner indicate that the public is willing to pay him as a skilled and responsible professional worker?

5. Is the practice of the profession limited or tending to be limited to persons with approved general and professional preparation?

6. Is there in fact a recognized systematic body of knowledge, skills and attitudes which can be identified and transmitted as a regimen of professional preparation?

7. Is the regimen of professional education recognized as of a quality appropriate for inclusion in the graduate and professional of-

ferings of a university?

If these criteria are valid the categories they establish must be exclusive, must apply only to the phenomenon we are attempting to describe. To the extent that the criteria fail to do so, their validity is open to question. These criteria should therefore hold only for

professions and for no other groups.

The first criterion can be tested by substituting the word "trade" for "profession". It then reads, does the trade have a well defined function, the nature of which can be identified? The answer would have to be yes, just as in the case of a profession. Similar substitutions can also be made in critera 3 and 5 — Does the trade have a unified pattern of organization that can speak for it with one voice — and is the practice of the trade limited or tending to be limited to persons with approved general and trade preparation? The answers here also would be yes.

Criterion #2 is of interest since it raises a question of ethics and philosophy. Are the authors saying that only professionals should achieve the state described in this criterion — a philosophy and code of ethics transcending the bounds of political, sectarian and economic self-interest? If so, it seems we leave ourselves open to the accusation of suffering from a messianic or "chosen people" complex since social scientists and others would say these goals are desirable for society as a whole rather than for any one select group.

The fourth criterion represents what is essentially the existence of status as a basis for profession. Six and seven are essentially asp-

ects of one question — whether the profession rests on some discipline characterized by a synthesis of philosophy and knowledge, attitudes and skills based upon scientific method as its essential core.

It seems to me that this set of criteria does not clarify the concept of profession but confuses by its uncritical mixing of the factors of status, economic goals and philosophical and scientific goals.

The concept profession is a hazy one to most if not all of us. It is essentially, I believe, a concept of the middle class. A tool and die maker, a carpenter or a seaman does not strive for acceptance of his work as a profession. "Profession" is a label, attached to a way of earning a living, which separates the holder from manual laborers no matter how skilled. In a class stratified society, such as ours, status has value socially and economically and the further removed from productive labor, in the economist's sense, the higher the potential status. Profession is not something you achive, but a form of status, related to your way of earning a living, conferred upon you by the community or a segment of it. From this point of view criterion #4 (Does the compensation received by the professional practitioner indicate that the public is willing to pay him as a skilled and responsible professional worker?) takes on some significance in further delimiting what it is we are striving for in social work. Playing baseball, being a musician, being a prize-fighter, is considered a profession. The public is willing to pay some of the people in these professions phenomenal salaries indicating their acceptance of them as skilled and responsible professional workers. If we can isolate the essential difference between the concept of a skilled trade, a profession as represented by any of the sports, music, art, dance, theatre and one of the professions like medicine, law, dentistry, etc., we will have found the basis on which to build our concepts of social work education.

The remaining criteria deal with the conditions for the existence of a discipline. The fundamental difference or the unique quality setting aside the medical profession (or law, or dentistry) from the others derives from the requirement of the use of scientific method as the basis for the accummulation of a body of knowledge which permits of prediction and which is transmissible in an organized form. I have no objection to the use of the word profession to describe the above but it must be recognized that we are referring not to the status concept but to the concept of a discipline which rules out the use of intuition, hunch, the supernatural, innuendo or feeling as a basis for practice. A quick look at the development of medicine makes this implication stand out in even bolder relief. In its

early beginnings anyone who desired to do so could practice medicine. Barbers practiced medicine in those days. They became expert at bloodletting, the method of effecting cures. As recently as 50 years ago you learned your medicine by apprenticeship - the concept of internship is a carryover from those days. Medicine was learned, much as the carpenter's apprentice or the social worker still does, by acquiring specific skills which are not necessarily interrelated and which are not based upon any fundamental understanding of the processes involved. Any given problem was solved in a similar manner to that in which the teacher had solved it and he in turn taught the solution as he had been taught it. However, in a new situation the apprentice-taught practitioner whether carpenter, doctor or social worker, is essentially at a loss to adapt his training to that new situation except through trial and error, hunch or guess with no basis for prediction or even establishing cause and effect relationships between what he does and the results achieved.

However, as medicine, the profession, became more and more dependent upon the various disciplines of physiology, anatomy, chemistry, physics, biochemistry, physical chemistry and a host of others, a qualitative change took place in medicine and it too became a discipline as it subjected itself to the rigorous demands of scientific method in testing its methodology and concepts. Since medicine was a profession before it was established as a discipline, the characteristics of the discipline became grafted onto the concept of profession without any real differentiation in peoples' minds as to their diverse origins. It would seem to me that it is of the utmost importance to differentiate between the two aspects — profession and discipline. Our desire to be respected for our ideas, recommendations and proposals will approach the realm of possible achievement only to the extent that we establish a claim to rigorous, careful and precise performance in accumulating our knowledge as have the natural sciences and the professions allied with them. It seems to me that our concern should be less with becoming labeled a profession and more with establishing ourselves as a discipline — a body of men and women dedicated to helping society to solve its problems basing ourselves upon a body of knowledge accumulated under rigorous scientific methodology. We will continue to flounder in both our practice as well as in our educational goals until such time as we begin to base ourselves upon the contributions and findings of the social science disciplines of sociology, psychology, economics, political science, social psychology, history and others and make their discipline an integral part of ourselves. What I am inferring is that even if the

community were willing to confer professional status upon us at this moment we would be no further along to a solution of the problems plaguing us in training social workers. If we have a concept of social work as a discipline there is no insurmountable difficulty involved in determining that there should be specific undergraduate training leading toward graduate training for social work. It also gives us a lead as to the possible content of new undergraduate courses which might need to be created. It is not difficult to decide that undergraduates who might be interested in training for social work should have some opportunity to become acquainted with social agencies and to have some experience in them as part of their educational

preparation.

ine.

at

ars

of

red.

by

and

oro-

ner

the

the

cial

sit-

asis

be-

de-

em-

ers,

dis-

tific

was

ter-

sion

erse

e to

ine.

oro-

the

per-

nces

cern

vith

men

lves

tific

as

pase

ence

SO-

in-

the

What do we mean by discipline or science? Many social workers insist that social work cannot be a science - that it is an art. As one social worker put it, "We don't want social work to be a science. You can't put people into test tubes like so many chemicals." It is unfortunate that so many know so little about a concept which concerns them so much. In reality science, in a basic sense, has little to do with test tubes and chemicals. Science is essentially an attitude, a methodology, an approach to attempting to understand the world about us in a rational manner. It is an attempt to understand things based upon reason, rather than guess, hunch, supernatural explanation or intuition. The laboratory, the test tubes and other paraphernalia are some of the techniques which have been developed as a means of collecting data for use in the scientific methodology. It is unfortunate that many of us are better acquainted with the techniques of science rather than with its basic mehodology and philosophy. Another misconception to which many have a commitment is that science is devoid of emotion or feeling and therefore is not applicable to human beings and their needs. This is an illusion which must be laid to rest if we are ever to realize the potential of scientific social work. Science does not rule out the desire or need for feeling or emotion. Science recognizes that it reaches its greatest effectiveness when there is the integration of emotion and reason. All science attempts to do is to control emotion so that it can be used most effectively. In this sense social work, as at present constituted, holds this goal in common with science.

Closely related to the problem of a desire for professional status and primary in importance for the future of social work education is the need to answer the basic question of whether we train people for a discipline dedicated to social reform and social change or to the maintenance of the status quo. Since we are in the midst of an educational inventory, we might well examine the history of our field, our origins, and where we are going. Social Work was born as a reaction to the effects upon people, particularly the working class, of the breakdowns in our soicety. Most of the early leaders were great social reformers — people concerned with social change. It is no accident that some people still look upon social workers as impractical dreamers. Not that the early leaders were. Many of their dreams are reality today. But in every era, those who advocated social change, who criticized the status quo and refused to conform to it, were labeled in some derogatory manner in order to stifle the appeal their ideas had for others.

A subtle change is taking place in social work. Perhaps it is not so subtle. But all around us we see theory and practice which call for greater and greater conformity - conformity to national, state and local demands. I suspect our desire to achieve professional status has had something to do with this development. We feel we have to conform if we are to gain acceptance. It is no longer polite to stir up things; controversial issues are taboo; pressure groups are all right - as long as they are not identified with us; and we have lengthy "learned" discussions on whether social action is social work or is another field. These are merely some of the indications. There are others. Community centers now talk of serving everyone - not merely the underprivileged. An excellent idea. But what happens in actuality? The program is changed and sometimes, when money permits, the location also, so as better to serve all the groups. But we soon find that the underprivileged groups are excluded - whether by intent or not is immaterial.

To remove the goal of social reform and social change from social work is to hollow out the field and create a void. Social work was born out of the need for social reform and change. It is the responsibility of social work education to educate people prepared to organize and give leadership for social change. If this means we never achieve the status of a profession, it is no great loss, in my opinion. To climb to professional status through indifference to the misery and suffering of peoples is a price social workers will reject.

Crucial here again is the decision of whether we are training for a profession or for a discipline. Disciplines, based on scientific method, place a premium on democratic education in which there is a full field for the mutual interchange of ideas whereas education for status oriented professions which stress prestige, economic exclusiveness and authority must orient toward authoritiarian methods of education.

It is essential to clarify our goals and educational philosophy if we are to create a base for our educational planning which will not crumble at the first strong wind of criticism. It seems to me that the usual emphasis on curriculum in developing an educationl program will not meet the problem. Curriculum is important. But in our concern with curriculum content we have often lost sight of the basic manner in which people learn and change. And our educational process is essentially that - a learning experience leading to change in people. Our past approach to social work education has been inadequate. We have treated subject matter and the student as if they existed in a vacuum. We have not looked upon the educational structure as a social unit in which the student and curriculum are segments of an interrelated whole consisting of faculty, administration, agencies, supervisors and others. This is the social system in which the student is exposed to significant experiences intended to induct him into the "culture" of social work. It is not possible for the student to experience all aspects of the larger community of social work. It is therefore necessary for the school to select those experiences which will guide the growth of the student toward achieving his educational goals. It is the interaction among the various factors of this social system which will determine what experiences learners will have and consequently what they will learn.

In observing the manner in which the society carries on and regulates its life relationship we learn our own values and develop patterns of behavior. The relatedness of roles in our society become fixed for us and we usually imitate that behavior when we find ourselves in similar roles. To teach democratic process in a teacherdominated class room, where the students know their role is to listen quietly, and to participate only when called upon and where they are permitted safely rebellious behavior on minor issues only, is to guarantee that the student learns not to participate, to keep his ideas to himself and to defer to authority. If the relation between the administration and the faculty is of similar authoritarian nature, the initial experience is reinforced. Similarly with agency field work experience. You can train people to have inquiring minds but if your agency supervisor tells you, when you ask a question about agency policy, never to forget you are a student and never to dare question policy again, you begin to have some question about the desirability of an inquiring mind. Similarly with practice. It is the experience the student has in field work practice which will to a very large extent determine his functioning as a social worker rather than his training in the class room - not because field work is a more effective

way of learning but because its impact is inescapable in terms of the demonstrated realities of job-getting and job-holding. How can you expect a student to utilize what he learns in the classroom when even before he graduates into the field he hears about how impractical is the theory he learns: "that stuff is all right in school but you're working in an agency now — it's different."

All this emphasizes the need not only for closer integration of school experience and field work but the inclusion of total agency policy and practice as part of the social structure of social work education. I am not proposing that the schools should dictate the policies of agencies but I am suggesting that agencies should show more responsibility for raising the standards of their own practice. I am also suggesting that some agencies might be tied in organically with schools of social work such as some hospitals are an integral

part of medical schools.

The school, the classroom and the agency must recognize and accept that conflict and struggle are the basis for learning. Without them there is no fundamental learning-merely the accumulation of information. Learning takes place as ideas and concepts are placed in opposition to one another, as we assess and evaluate the opposing ideas. Where only one set of ideas is presented, there can be no learning, but only rote-memorization. This means for me that administration-faculty, administration-student, student-faculty, school-agency, student-agency relations or any other combination you may think of, must be based upon the acceptance of conflict and struggle as an integral part of those relationships. It does not mean a situation in which students say, "I'd better not raise a fuss; I want my degree." What it does mean is that in all relationships in our educational process people must feel free to challenge, to question, to explore, to fight for ideas. It means that nothing need be accepted merely because of authority. It means a relationship developed between school, agency and student in which mutual respect and struggling together lead to a learning experience.

What are some of the implications for us in education for group work?

Must we take time out to clarify our philosophy and goals? I would say this is crucial. It is necessary for us to examine how to change the situation in our agencies which are essentially organized to express the relationship between the givers and the receivers. The givers make policy and the receivers receive it. Are we prepared to accept the idea that the recipients of our agencies services

should have a significant role in formulating policy? How far are we ready to go in this direction?

We need to examine whether we are doing group work or doing case work in a group setting or whether we're even doing social work. The essence of the problem for us is to become clear in our minds whether our major concern is with groups and group goals or individuals and individual goals. If we don't clarify it for our-

selves, others may.

of

ın

n

C-

ıt

ρf

y

k

е.

y

ıl

d

e

e

3

Is social action an integral part of our goals and aims? Are group work agencies becoming little more than social centers solely concerned with leisure time recreational activities? Should we move out from behind the protection of the expensive walls we are building, into the community? What about competition of agencies for clients — or should I say customers? These are some of the questions crying for answers and we will not be in a position to deal

with them until we have clarified our aims and goals.

Every time I am faced with placing a student in a group work agency, I invariably am asked, "What skills does this person have" (referring to Arts and Crafts, Sports, Dancing, etc.) If I say the person has none or that I don't know, the agency raises serious questions about our placing the student. Since when has group work become dependent upon any other skill than the skill to work with people? I would say we have been overemphasizing in our training the need for skills to qualify as a group worker. It seems to me it is of utmost importance for a group worker to know something about how and why groups are formed, something of the history of groups, the effect of group life on the development of the individual, the role of groups in our society and the dynamics of group behavior. Without such basic orientation to the fundamental characteristics of groups we can never rise above being practitioners who view each situation and every problem as unique. It is essential that we begin to view our problems and our field with a disciplined approach.

It seems essential that the emphasis in group work training should be placed primarily upon training for social work. This does not mean imposing a case work or psychiatric orientation or sequence upon group workers. It does mean a greater emphasis upon history, philosophy and goals of social work and of group work. Findings from sociology, social psychology, anthropology, psychology and other social sciences leading to deepened understanding of groups, their organization and dynamics should be included. Among these

courses might be included some skills courses.

As a final thought I'd like to leave with you the problem dealing with our responsibility for training people to do research in group work. It seems to me until we - all of us - become research conscious and begin to develop a core of researchers, we will encounter great difficulty in coming of age. Without research we might still achieve status as a profession, as a discipline — never!

Morris L. Eisenstein is Assistant Executive Director of Jewish Community Centers, Denver, Colorado.

# DEMOCRATIC GROUP SELF-DETERMINATION David Fogel

There has been confusion, for some time, over the terms group self-determination and group decision-making. This paper will concern itself almost exclusively with the former yet there is a need for clarity of terms at the outset. This writer assumes self-determination to be a principle and decision-making to be a process. Funk and Wagnall states that a principle is "a permanent or fundamental cause that naturally or necessarily produces certain results." If we then accept democratic self-determination as a principle we have invested in it certain qualities that the profession agrees will produce certain socially desirable results. A process is defined as "a course or method of operations natural or artificial incident to the accomplishment of a result, a systematic series of actions in the production of something." Here again the profession has isolated the democratic decision-making process and agreed upon a method of operations that will be "incident to the accomplishment of" socially desirable result.

Casework was the first to apply the generic principle of selfdetermination. Underlying social work's definition of self-determination is the belief in the individual worth of man and respect for his integrity. Each person is unique in himself with his life goals and therefore, is entitled to self-made solutions. Gordon Hamilton states that each client has a right to be himself, has a right to his own decisions, and has a right to work out his own problems. (1) (Hamilton, Gordon "Basic Concepts Upon Which Case-Work Practices

is Formulated." N.C.S.W. 1945, p. 141.)

A recent doctoral thesis reduces the principles of client self-determination to three propositions. Casework literature necessarily refers to the *client* but we can simply replace the word client with group and the definition would alternately read:

"1. The client (group) has a right and a need to be free in mak-

ing his (its) own decisions.

"2. The caseworker (groupworker) has a corresponding duty to respect that right, in theory and in practice by refraining from any direct or indirect interference with it, and by positively helping the client (group) to exercise that right.

"3. The client's (group's) right to freedom however, is limited by the client's (group's) capacity for positive and constructive self-determination by the framework of social and moral good, by law and authority, by the standards of the community, and by the function of the agency." (2) (Biestek, Felix P. "The Principle of Client Self-Determination." Journal of Social Case Work, Vol. XXXII, No. 9, November 1951, p. 1.)

In Harleigh Trecker's definition of group self-determination it is said that the group should be helped to make its own decisions, determine its own activities and take responsibility in relation to its capacity and ability. If the foregoing have validity then it is obvious that the worker with the group must be sensitive to the group climate and understand the multiple factors that allow a group to assume greater responsibilities without undue burden. Aside from this technical know-how a worker must be emotionally ready to allow a group to grow in its own direction when compatible with community's values. In order to apply the principle of democratic group self-determination the leader should also be ready to accept each individual and group as unique entities and believe in their right to be different from other. He should be non-judgmental in his use of authority and have an "ability to support individuals and groups in factoring out the issues in problems facing them, yet refrain from indicating the solutions..." (3) (Wilson, Gertrude and Ryland, Gladys (Social Groupwork Practice, Houghton Mifflin, New York, 1949, pp. 22-23.) Finally a leader needs to be sufficiently mature to help support individual members and the group as a whole in carrying out their own decisions although they may be in conflict with his own set of values. "The group worker consciously applies his art so that the impetus, initiative and responsibility for life comes from within the group." (4) (Cooke, Rev. Terence I. Thomistic Philosophy in the Principles of Group Work. Catholic University of America, Washington, D. C. 1951, pp. 91.)

Synthesizing what some leading author's have said it can be briefly summed up that at present we understand the principle of democratic group self-determination to be a dynamic integration of at least four factors; the group, the worker, the decision-making process and limitations however represented. Graphically shown some of the elements the worker must be cognizant of in each factor are:

The Group	Worker	Decision-making Process	Limitations
"where it is" level of bond values individuals	self-awareness relationship acceptance identification stimulate when needed enabler education	right to choose group structure democratic procedures realistic planning executing evaluating program handling of feelings that block participation	group's capacity for constructive self-determination agency community society

We shall content ourselves with what we have described as selfdetermination for the moment and move on to illustrative case material to see what it means in a real life situation. The first case will concern itself primarily with a group and the second case will show us the worker's dilemma.

A group of fourteen to sixteen year old boys accepted the responsibility of organizing and running a dance for the whole agency. The agency allowed the group the use of its auditorium without charge. The group had to decorate it, sell pop, operate the record player, be at the door to sell tickets and help clean up after the dance. Since it was a fund raising affair the group began projecting ideas of buying club sweaters. The worker was happy to see such enthusiasm. Individual jobs were assigned to three members and two others volunteered. An omen of disaster appeared when only one boy came to help decorate the auditorium. Mickey did not buy the records he promised, Don did not make the posters needed, the pop was unordered. On the evening of the dance itself all the jobs were haphazardly handled with no one really doing what he was supposed to. The dance was a relative financial success — the overt goal — but the group was depressed.

A goal was set and met with relative success yet there was little satisfaction involved for any of the members. This is not a paradox since the group had little to choose when the goal was set and had less influence in reaching it.

Firstly, this was not an example of democratic group self-determination although the group "freely" chose to have a dance and made somewhat of a success out of it. Democratic decision-making

was obviously lacking. This group had never had an experience of this nature before. The idea was introduced and accepted but only in terms of what it would lead to — sweaters. There was a minimal amount of participation by individual members and less understanding of their roles. The group was not really freely choosing because they were not aware of the implications of their choice. Finally the experience was frustrating because a follow-up evaluation did not take place.

Using the criticism the worker helped the group to plan and execute a second dance. The process was one of sitting down and taking inventory of the specific situation. Where "is" the group? These were teenagers — what does the worker know of teen age life, their ability to accept responsibility, their ambivalence around feelings of independence and dependence. What is the level of individual participation? What are some of the external factors that help or restrict a member from accepting responsibility? Is the atmosphere one where the group can say "no"? Is there a democratic structure so that members can freely discuss and participate in planning? Have they an experience of successful planning? Do their values conflict with agency, community or society? These are some of the questions that the worker asked himself before the group was ready to plan another dance.

The objective was still to purchase club sweaters. When the idea of a second dance was suggested there was not a great deal of enthusiasm shown. The worker began by having the group evaluate the last dance. Mistakes were seen, suggestions for corrections were made and this was the actual beginning of planning for the second dance. The worker now presented the entire over-all picture so that each could see his particular role and a sense of interdependence for the whole activity was realized. Each job was discussed by the whole group, so that the individual members could realistically choose a job in which the responsibilities would be related to their

individual capacities.

The next job was to make sure each member individually understood his own responsibility. Four weeks were spent in pre-dance planning. This time the omen that appeared was a happy one: all but one came to decorate. In summary all the jobs were handled with degrees of success. The dance was (perhaps by accident) the best attended all year and they made more money than expected. The dance was a great financial success but it was not the main cause for elation. They had organized and operated a dance and received due recognition from their peers and the agency. A week later an

evaluation was held and this helped to reinforce their individual and collective spirit of really having accomplished something. They were masters to some extent of the environment about them, with some effort they could become dynamic agents in molding the conditions for personal and social happiness — in a word they felt that they were self-determining.

The principle becomes more intelligible in practice because we merge the intellect and our emotions - we not only see but we feel what it means. This case however was a "success story". Let's look at one that is still in progress and points up a few areas of sharp controversy for the group worker. Nathan E. Cohen says that social group work is a method and a process which can be used in a variety of settings. The head of a local religious Sunday School apparently recognized this when he specifically asked that one of his teachers have a group work background. Two factors conditioned his thinking. Firstly, because the particular two classes he had in mind had a high teacher mortality rate and he thought that a social group worker could help to solve this problem. Secondly, he was afraid that these young adolescents were learning rites, rituals, traditions and customs by rote and actually were gaining little in personal growth and conviction. He thought the group worker could relate the textbook to their everyday living. This was a radically new approach and although the discipline problem disappeared in a few weeks, other problems did arise for the teacher. This was an authoritarian setting. The book and the agency did take the position, for example, that intermarriage was taboo. In this context could a worker with the conviction that intermarriage was an individual not an organized religious choice honestly accept employment here? The worker also felt the responsibility not to fool the agency. For the purpose of our present concern let's see how the class was affected. Many of them felt the same way without knowing the teacher's thoughts yet their parents sent them to school to get the specific religious approach. Can this situation be conducive to selfdetermination? The worker took the position of stating the religious approach but when asked, had to honestly divorce himself from it. The class was given the orthodox position but encouraged to think about it. They were never asked not to accept it. In other words the worker was not destroying agency objects but he was walking a tight-rope across them.

Assuming that intermarriage is the democratic concept could the worker feel free to allow the class to democratically decide in its

favor contrary to the agency objectives? Clearly not. In a recent articles, *Group Workers and Professional Ethics*, L. K. Hall gives some tentative answers to this dilemma.

The moral obligation, then on the group worker is to accept democratic goals and to use democratic methods in developing in groups the attitudes and skills of democratic living ... The extent to which agencies will require group workers under their direction to give expression to the agency's overall objectives may vary. Perhaps a worker in an independent social settlement will feel somewhat less obligated by the agency's philosophy than would a worker say in a Catholic Youth Organization, or in a Y.M.C.A. or in a camp conducted by a religious agency. I am not sure this is so; but I am sure that the group worker makes a mistake when he tries to divorce himself entirely from agency context... When the agency is found by the worker not to believe in the values implicit for individuals or groups in a democracy the group worker may have no alternative but to resign. (5) (Hall, L. K. "Group Workers and Professional Ethics." The Group. Vol. XV, No. 1, October 1952, pp. 6-7.)

It should be repeated that the worker "may have no alternative" but he should take every avenue open to clarify his and presumably the profession's democratic principle that is causing the conflict.

In the case under discussion the worker sees his dilemma. On one hand, hired as a social group worker he wishes to apply the principle of self-determination and on the other he is paid ostensibly to teach "restrictive" thinking. Group work takes place in relation to a total societal setting. We do not have Baptist group, Jewish group work, Catholic group work, etc.... Mr. Hall adds that group work's "context is our total way of life. An individual's adjustment, adequately conceived, is to our total way of life. Our way of life places the values of individual personality above all, but to make this achievement possible for each individual requires each individual to accept the philosophy of it." (6) (Ibid, p. 8.)

Indoctrination is involved but unlike the case of the Sunday School which narrows the approach to fuller living we are here indoctrinating people for democratic social living — widening their horizons. It should be emphasized that although social workers generally subscribe to the latter point of view they must still respect the former. Indoctrination is sometimes felt to have a negative connotation especially for social group workers concerned with free self-expression. The dictionary, if I may be permitted, states its meaning as "to imbue with learning principles, or doctrine." Dr. Bryn Hovde

was quoted at the 1950 National Conference of Social Work as stating that

Collective action of individuals in groups is inevitable, but it behooves those who assume the responsibility of group leadership to achieve a basic democratic purpose which consciously employs the group in support of democracy... The best group for the purpose of democracy is that which is so composed as to present the individual with most of the problems of democracy at each level. (6b) (Berry, Margaret "Grouping Devices for Intercultural Goals. Agency-Initiated Groups" N.C.S.W. 1950, p. 285.)

Democratic behavior is, like other behavior, learned. If we consciously encourage those attitudes and acceptance of those values that contribute to democratic disciplines — are we then not indoctrinating? Most assuredly we are and maybe it is time we realized it so that we will not withdraw from further responsibilities to do so.

The next logical and perhaps inevitable question to arise will be "Is this not contrary to the principle of democratic group self-determination?" I think it can be answered only by understanding and applying all our other principles. The social group worker is the Sunday School, in addition to settling personal ethical problems, will also have to accept the group "where it is". However, his further responsibility, and this is generically true, is NOT to leave the group there but to help it move in the direction we assume forward. This is using the principle of self-determination in a helpful way. If individuals are blocked by a myopic view of life, an undemocratic orientation, or immobilized by a neurosis they cannot freely determine their future or make their maximum social contribution until the block is removed. The job of the social group worker is to help the individual and the group "in factoring out the issues in problems facing them, yet refrain from indicating the solutions... to support individuals and groups in making and carrying out their own decisions . . ." (7) (Wilson & Ryland, op. cit., p. 23)

We do not know with any degree of certainty as yet but in order to work in a helpful way with this principle we must assume that when presented with a choice and adequately prepared to choose, the individual and group will decide a course that will contribute to their personal growth and at the same time be socially acceptable. Any other position will not respect the integrity of the individual. Trecker states that "the principle of self-determination in group work assumes that groups accepted into a relationship with the agency have the right to make choices, and the potential capacity to make

satisfactory decisions." (8) (Trecker, H., op. cit., p. 168) Like individuals, no two groups are the same.

There is a real difference between 'knowing what is best' for a group and knowing the group so as to help it determine what is better for it. The worker thus gives up any need to have 'power over the group' and, instead, works with the group on the basis of his ability to share his wider experience, competence and expertness. At times the worker may have to assume a temporarily authoritarian role with certain individuals to permit the group to become self-determining. (9) (Trecker, H. op. cit., p. 169.)

Here again one may question the principle of self-determination in relation to the minority vote of a group in the decision-making process or the unwilling-to-behave individual just described. A general answer for social group workers should state that our goals are social, therefore democratic group self-determination usually depends on majority votes—informed majorities. The minorities are as much a part of the total picture, therefore, even though these individuals might not have been personally and immediately rewarded they are nevertheless being helped to democratically participate. We are all in minorities at times yet none of us is always in a minority.

The role of the worker in the application of this principle will of course vary with groups and at different stages of the same group. It is nevertheless his responsibility to inspire the group to assume progressively increased amounts of responsibilities for its decisions and activities in accordance with what the worker professionally appraises to be within the group's capacity and maturity. "When the group worker gives vitality to the principle of self-determination it is interesting to note that he is less likely to feel 'personally' responsible for success or failure of the group." (10) (Ibid.)

There is little basic disagreement among leading authors in group work concerning the worker's role in the application of the principle of democratic group self-determination. Most agree that the worker will of necessity at times make decisions due to agency and community standards. All, however, agree that the worker should move out of this area as much as is feasible. Perhaps the one certainty that can be drawn from this entire discussion regardless of minor degrees of differences around the stated principle, is that a social group worker does not work with a single principle at a time. The idea of democratic self-determination is a derived principle and therefore must be practiced by worker who accept democratic procedures as a method and are capable of creating an atmosphere that

will produce a context for the application of this principle. In order to accept and apply the principle of democratic group self-determination the worker necessarily becomes involved in a tie-in sale that requires acceptance and application of all the basic principles of social work.

# BIBLIOGRAPHY

- 1. Biested, Felix P. "The Principle of Client Self-Determination." Journal of Social Casework. Vol. XXXII, No. 9, November 1951.
- 2. Cohen, Nathan E. "The Function of the Social Group Work Agencies." Proceedings National Conference of Social Work. 1949. pp. 196-204.
- 3. Cooke, Rev. Terence J. Thomistic Philosophy in the Principles of Group Work. Catholic University of America, Washington, D. C., 1951.
- 4. Hall, L. K. "Group Workers and Professional Ethics." The Group. Vol.
- XV, No. 1, October 1952, pp. 3-8.

  5. Hamilton, Gordon "Basic Concepts Upon Which Case-Work Practice is Formulated." Proceedings National Conference of Social Work. 1945, pp. 138-149.
- 6. Trecker, Harleigh Social Group Work Principles and Practices. Women's Press, New York, 1948.
- 7. Wilson, Gertrude and Ryland, Gladys Social Group Work Practice. Houghton Mifflin, New York, 1949.
- 8. Berry, Margaret "Grouping Devices for Intercultural Goals-I. Agency Initiated Groups" N.C.S.W. 1950 278-286.
- David Fogel is Director of Activities of the Omaha Jewish Community Center, Omaha, Nebraska.

# A NOTE ON THE SPATIAL AND SOCIAL PATTERN OF A SMALL DISCUSSION GROUP

# Jiri Kolaja

One aspect of the small group is its spatial pattern of interacting persons1. Bavelas2, Leavit3, Heise and Miller4 found that patterns affected the efficiency of group problem solving and sometimes dictated leadership. But the experimenter developed the pattern of communication a priori under laboratory conditions and the subjects had to accept the preestablished pattern.

In contrast Steinzor<sup>5</sup> and Bass and Klubeck<sup>6</sup> let the members of the group communicate at their own will with anybody in the group. Steinzor noted that among the members of a discussion group whose circular seating pattern was established around a table, those who were not sitting beside each other tended to communicate more with each other. Steinzor explained this tendency as a result of better mutual observation. One can look more easily at a person sitting opposite than at a person seated by his side. Studying the influence of the spatial pattern on the development of leadership, Bass and Klubeck concluded that the spatial pattern was of negligible importance in determining the leadership status.

Festinger and Thibault<sup>7</sup> without analyzing the spatial pattern of a discussion group, found that when there was a range of opinion in the group, the communications tended to be directed towards those members whose opinions are at the extremes of the range. Hence the social pattern may affect the frequency and direction of interactions within the group more than the spatial pattern.

The following note refers to our observation within a semi-informal discussion group of ten students and one professor who met for a period of four months once a week. The seminar, called "Dynamics of Personality", consisted of group-interviews. Every member of the group was interviewed once during the session by all other members of the group. The seating order of the class was developed at random at the first session and kept constant through all the sessions. The people sat around a rectangle table.

The author of this note took occasional data on the order of questions directed at the interviewee. The data supplied are not systematic but serve only as an exploratory study in the typology of the

small group discussions.

Since only one person was interviewed at a time, there was already a certain preestablished pattern imposed upon the group anybody in the group was free to ask the interviewee a question. Thus the order of those who asked the questions was of interest. From the analysis of data referring to the order of questioning, no conclusion as to the influence of the seating pattern on the interviewers can be drawn. The pattern of questioning could rather be derived from the personalities of the pupils. The subjects more or less applied their personal patterns of participation throughout all the sessions, even though the location of the interviewee varied with each session. Consider for example subject No. 1. If we number all succeeding questions and answers by ordinals up to 10 and conceive of them as one set, we can find that No. 1 participated at least once within the majority of the 14 sets making up the whole interview with the person. The peck-order of No. 1 was: 3,5,1,0,3, (5 and 7), 1,6,0,4,0,10 (6 and 10). On the other hand within the same session No. 2 asked only two questions and those within the same set immediately following each other. The subject No. 2 participated generally to a lesser degree than other members of the group. And when he participated he tended to develop his questions in clusters. Hence two different types of participations emerged from the analysis: 1) the dispersed type of questioning by a subject who asks questions fairly permanently in regular intervals and 2) the sudden burst of a cluster of questions from the type who speaks occasionally. Between those two types the other persons developed their individual variations.

The students, although enjoying the informality of the meeting, felt the social pressure to ask questions. Their grades were partially based on their participation. Hence the regular and recurrent questioning of some subjects may have resulted from the social pressure. Subject No. 2 who audited the course only was not under the pressure and asked questions only when interested. Then he persevered in asking until he completely exhausted the area of his interest.

The conclusion suggested by our exploratory observation follows: the spatial pattern of a small semi-informal interviewing group is less important than its social pattern. The social pattern was characterized by a tendency of the students to ask the questions regularly. When a short silence broke out, the professor often stepped in, asking a question himself. The professor was obviously under the influence of social pressure, too.

In general the participants within a discussion group tended to represent two types of participation. There are those who tend to ask or give opinions for the asking itself, caring less for the content. These are the group-minded persons. On the other hand, there are persons who ask a question when their interests are aroused. They are the content-minded persons.

We could also say that the greater the formality of the meeting, the greater the group-orientation of the speeches. The group-minded speeches often help to overcome the social distances among the members of the group. One has to speak in order to be accepted, to break the social ice. The content has to be communicated within a certain group-minded shelf.

# BIBLIOGRAPHY

<sup>1.</sup> Argyle, M. "Methods of Studying Small Social Groups", Brit. J. Psychol (Gen. Section) Vol 43, (1952) pp 269-279\*.

<sup>2.</sup> Bavelas, A. "Communication patterns in task-oriented groups" The

Policy Sciences, chap. 10, ed. D. Lerner and H. D. Lasswell, Stanford University 1951.

3. Leavitt, H. J., "Some Effects of certain communication patterns on group performance", H. Abnorm. Soc. Psychol, vol. 46, (1951), pp. 38-50.

- 4. Heise, B. A. and Miller, G. A., "Problem solving by small groups using various communication nets", J. Abnorm. Soc. Psychol, vol. 46 (1951) pp 327-35.
- Steinzor, B., "The Spatial Factor in Face to Face Discussion Groups",
   Abnorm. Soc. Psychol, Vol. 45 (1951), pp 552-555.
- 6. Bass, B. M. and Klubeck, S., "Effects of Seating Arrangement on leader-less Group Discussions", J. Abnorm. Soc. Psychol, Vol. 47 (1952) pp. 724-727.
- 7. Festinger, L., and Thibaut, J., "Interpersonal Communication in Small Groups", J. Abnorm. Soc. Psychol, Vol. 46 (1951) pp. 92-99.
- 8. Seminar, "Dynamics of Personality", led by Dr. Temple Burling at the N. Y. State School of I. L. R., Cornell U., 1952-3 term.
- \*A good survey of literature referring to different aspects under which the small group is studied today.

Jiri Kolaja is with the New York State School of Industrial and Labor Relations, Cornell University at Ithaca, New York.

### INTENSIVE INTERVIEWING IN COMMUNITY RESEARCH

#### Floyd Dotson

Participation in an advisory program for doctoral candidates in the School of Education of an Eastern state university has sharpened the author's awareness of the growing interest in the community among people in education. The next few years will undoubtedly see more student research projects from both schools of education and graduate departments of sociology in the area of school-community relations. It is primarily to those interested in this aspect of educational sociology that this discussion of the intensive interview in community field research is addressed.

The interview plays a unique role in sociological research. Collection of original data must proceed by one of two fundamental methods: direct observation or some form of the interview. Unfortunately, direct observation of social behavior in urban communities is at best difficult and usually impossible. To what extent, for instance, are the intricacies of family relationships open to the

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup>The questionaire is simply an indirect form of the interview.

researcher's view? If the investigator is to get the data he needs, he must perforce depend mainly upon what people are willing and able to tell him rather than upon what he himself can see. This fact inevitably carries with it important methodological implications since interviews capable of probing the variety and depth of human relationships are not easy.

There is to be sure an extensive literature on interviewing problems and techniques.<sup>2</sup> Nevertheless, the neophyte, as he attempts interviews demanding, let us say, an hour or more or repeated visits to the same informant, commonly discovers with some chagrin that assiduous reading in this literature has not prepared him for the realities of field-work. The simple fact is that the problems of intensive interviewing in the community have been almost, if not entirely, by-passed in the literature.<sup>3</sup>

The reasons for this neglect are not obscure. Most discussions of the interview assume a poll- or survey-type project. This kind of study, for which the data are collected on a short, formal schedule which can be filled out in a few minutes, is the most highly developed and hence has received the greatest attention. But getting and keeping rapport long enough for the respondent to answer a half dozen questions is a different matter from carrying through an intensive interview. Second, actual interviewing tends to be done for large studies by hired assistants who do not in the nature of the case write analyses of their experience. Finally, problems of interview procedure have been for the most part treated negatively. As sociology has matured, we have learned to worry about sample design, representativeness, validity, and reliability. Unfortunately, the chief result of this increasing methodological sophistication as it bears upon interview practice is a long list of negative injunctions. The neophyte, for example, is warned continually against injecting his own biases into his material by too great personal involvement in the interview. What he is not given - and this seems a strange

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup>A good introductory bibliography is listed in Mildred Parten, Surveys, Polls, and Samples (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1950), p. 382.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup>Problems and techniques of intensive interviewing have been much discussed by psychiatrists, psychologists and social workers. Clinical interviewing, however, should not be confused with interviewing for sociological research projects under field conditions in the community.

<sup>4&</sup>quot;It has frequently been said in opinion research that when an interviewer becomes competent, he can make a great deal more doing something other than opinion interviewing." — Alfred McClung Lee, "Individual and Organizational Research in Sociology," American Sociological Review, vol. 16 (October 1951), p. 700.

lacuna when the advice comes from sociologists — is a workable understanding of the social realities of the interview situation under the field conditions encountered in the usual community study.

Interviews conducted under field conditions in the community differ markedly in important respects from those conducted under more familiar circumstances. The interview is a very common data-collecting device; patients are interviewed by their physicians, students by teachers, employees by employers. But note that these are well understood social situations, with the respective statuses and role-expectations of the interviewer and interviewee clearly defined and accepted by both participants. Compare the authority to ask intimate and personal questions, as a right established in the norms, of a graduate student collecting data in the community for his dis-

sertation with that of a physician interviewing a patient.

When he presents himself at the door of the typical urban dweller's household, the fieldworker on a social science project must recognize that he comes as an intruder into privacy without much recognized authority for such intrusion. The role of social science investigator is still at best only partially understood in our society. If the interviewer is accepted, he enters the house of the interviewee in the more general role of "invited guest," with all that that fact implies. There are, for instance, carefully defined limits in our culture to the topics deemed suitable for polite conversation between strangers. Moreover, even if he means to be fully cooperative, the respondent is usually confused and uncertain as to just what is expected of him. Thus the interviewer is faced with the burden of initiating and carrying through a fairly intimate relationship without much recognized authority to do so, and often across class, age, and sex barriers which strain to the utmost his social skills, versatility, and adaptability.5

How utterly inappropriate, then, is too literal an interpretation of the injunction, "no personal involvement" in the interview! The interviewer-interviewee relationship in community field research is not and cannot be a one-way street, with the interviewer enthroned in Olympian "scientific" aloofness, simply asking questions and demanding answers. By its very nature the interview situation in the community is a social relationship, governed as all other social

relations by a set of role definitions and expectations.

The respondent's "definition of the situation" — and this is the crucial point to remember — will determine his motivation to give

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>5</sup>Cf. Earl L. Koos, Families in Trouble (New York: King's Crown Press, 1946), pp. 129-134.

or withhold the information which the interviewer seeks and must have if his study is to materialize. Presumably, the interviewer knows what he wants and is determined to get it. But how does the informant, cornered in his own living room, see the situation? What is there in it for him?

Let us first consider the negative side of this question of motivation. It is rare that the interviewer working on a sociological project, particularly if he is interviewing on a door-to-door basis without previous contacts in an urban neighborhood, does not meet some initial resistance. Why?

There are in fact many excellent reasons why people should not talk easily and freely to strangers. Techniques for manipulating and exploiting human relationships — advertising, salesmanship, and "public-relations" generally — have been highly developed in our society. When the interviewer knocks on the door of the ordinary urban household, he will do well to keep before him a lively picture of the many who have proceeded him: the omnipresent magazine salesman, the Fuller Brush man and his assorted colleagues, the bill collector, the political party worker, and the purveyor of religious tracts. It is thus no accident that the stock phrase which sometimes greets the interviewer before he can fully explain what he wants is, "No, I don't believe I'm interested."

In view of this widespread suspicion and distrust, why are most people willing, as the majority are, to be interviewed?

An important motivation which operates during the critical, initial stages in the interviewer's favor is nothing more nor less than curiosity. The interviewer represents something new in what may be a rather routine world. What is he doing? What is he up to? People will often play along, a little cagily perhaps, in order to find out. Obviously, this motivating factor is reinforced if the interviewer is able to communicate a feeling that he is doing something interesting and important, or that he is interesting as a person in his own right.

But curiosity cannot be depended upon beyond the initial phase. More substantial motivation is needed to carry through a long and complicated interview.

In his exceptionally insightful discussion, Kinsey stresses altruism as the main motivating force upon which the interviewer must depend for cooperation.<sup>6</sup> If people can be convinced that what they

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>6</sup>Alfred C. Kinsey, Wardell B. Pomeroy and Clyde E. Martin, Sexual Behavior in the Human Male (Philadelphia: W. B. Saunders, 1948), pp. 35-36.

have to contribute is worthwhile, or that they can help the interviewer as an individual, a surprisingly large reservoir of willing cooperation is tapped. Most of us like to view ourselves as friendly and helpful, particularly if what we are asked is nothing more ard-

uous than providing information.7

Unfortunately, altruism like curiosity has its limitations. First, working out a brief and intelligible explanation of his project and exactly what the respondent can contribute to it is not always an easy task. "You can't tell me," a skeptic once said to the author, "that what I can tell you can ever help to solve that problem." It is unflattering to the social scientist, but people see the point more quickly if they are asked to rate a brand of cigarettes or a radio program than if they are asked what their income is, who their friends are, and how often they attend church. Second, the amount of time which people will give and the degree of discomfiture which they will bear from purely altruistic motives is a highly variable matter. Altruism tends to wear thin quickly, particularly if the interview takes on an unpleasant, inquisitorial atmosphere through insistent questioning from a long formal schedule.

Ultimately, the interviewer will get furthest if he can appeal to a third motivation. It is a widely observed fact, to which all experienced in intensive interviewing can attest, that most people feel lonely to some degree and have a need for sympathetic response. Our everyday social contacts, hedged as they are by the inevitable inhibitions which grow up around them, do not ordinarily provide us with an opportunity to fully express ourselves. If the interviewer makes himself a sympathetic and patient listener, the interview may become a highly rewarding occasion for the informant. The problem in this case is twofold: first, to get sufficient rapport so that the informant is willing to talk freely, and, second, to keep the informant talking within the area in which the interviewer is interested, at least part of the time. Many of the revelations which seem so important to the informant are irrelevant to the interviewer's central goals and may be positively boring. Yet listening may be a small price to pay for the data in which the interviewer is interested, and which he could get in no other way.

<sup>7</sup>A working class woman informant for one of the author's projects put it this way:

<sup>&</sup>quot;I was talking to a neighbor about you after you were here before, and she said she wouldn't be bothered answering a lot of questions, and that besides, why should she be a guinea pig for someone to work on? But I don't feel that way at all. Heck, if I can help somebody out I'm more than glad to do so as long as it don't cost me nothing."

Curiosity, altruism, the need for sympathetic response: these are the motivations upon which the fieldworker interviewing in the modern community must ordinarily depend. Perhaps all of them are present at different times in most long interviews. The skilled fieldworker learns to "play by ear," so to speak, and to adjust his approach accordingly.

There is a fourth motivation which is in fact seldom resorted to in sociological research, although it is widely employed by anthropologists. Informants may be paid for the information, thus putting the relationship, at least initially, on a commercial basis. In his intensive case-studies of the impact of unemployment upon family and community relationships, Bakke used a small payment as an entree into the confidence of the families which he studied.8 An arrangement was made with the families to keep a household income and expense budget, which was personally collected and paid for by the interviewer once a week. When he called, the interviewer stayed and talked as long as he seemed welcome. If funds are available, the same sort of device would seem to be widely applicable, especially if time-budgets were substituted for economic ones. Investigators studying the social and educational impact of television, for example, might seriously consider this technique as a means of collecting data.

We have tried to show in this paper how intensive interviews for community research differ from the poll-type assumed in most discussions of interviewing problems and techniques. We have emphasized the importance of understanding the social situation within which such interviews take place, and the problem of creating motivation in the respondent to give information freely. Experienced fieldworkers, if they are successful, eventually acquire this knowledge intuitively as "practical" experience, but as long as their knowledge remains at this level, they cannot communicate it. An analytical understanding such as that which we have tried to present here is no substitute for experience, but it should help the would-be fieldworker to gain more quickly the skill necessary to do his job.

<sup>8</sup>E. Wight Bakke, "Research Methods for the Study of Adjustments of Workers to Unemployment" (New Haven: Institute of Human Relations, Yale University, 1941), mimeographed pamphlet.

Floyd Dotson is in the Department of Sociology at University of Connecticut at Storrs, Connecticut.

# UNCONTROLLED OBSERVATION AS A SOURCE OF RESEARCH DATA

#### Harry Estill Moore

This paper is an attempt to assess the value for research purposes of information gathered while observing school superintendents as they attempt to aid in improvement of the communities in which

they are employed.

Programs have been established in nine towns, selected to represent the greatest possible diversity. In each case the problems to be attacked and the manner of attack have been left to local decision. Any funds spent locally have been provided by the communities. The regional program has paid expenses of an advisor from a cooperating college and has provided some consultant service. However, the primary task of the central office has been to observe, with particular emphasis on observation of how the local programs were conceived and executed, in an effort to get at the role of the administrator in community action. The advisor and consultants have refused, in so far as possible, to assume any direction of the program, but have tried to secure a rapport which enables them to "look over the shoulder" of the administrator as he works. Local administrators and advisors have kept record of varying completeness and clarity on the activities.

The result has been the collection of a mass of materials on a variety of projects, ranging from securing land and building football fields to a psychiatrically-oriented analysis of case records of problem pupils. Organizaton of a Grade-A dairy farmers' association was the first effort in one town. In another a series of lectures was delivered on the culture of the Spanish-speaking people of Texas.

Self-improvement has been the one common factor imposed on these communities. But a few other common factors emerged immediately as they began to select action programs. The economic base on which the community rested, relations between race and ethnic groups — where there was more than one such group — recreation, home and family life, the public relations task of the school administrator were (common) concerns in every case. These, then, would seem to be common problems these school men recognized and were willing to attack.

Similarities also appeared in the manner of attack. In every case the school board was involved; usually by asking permission to spend time and money on the program; in a few cases through receiving reports of what was being done. In every community but one, the school administrator felt it necessary or desirable to secure formal community backing through setting up some sort of community committee or council to assist in planning and executing programs. In some cases this initial committee later was broken into sub-committees and new persons added to attack particular problems, with the original committee retaining over-all functions. In each case, there was a narrowing down of proposals from the general toward the specific and the elimination of some of the proposals which, on closer examination, did not seem feasible.

During the two years in which the Cooperative Program in Educational Administration, financed in part by the Kellogg Foundation, has been in active operation these nine communities have compiled an impressive record of achievement. Football fields have been built. Teachers have learned about, and become interested in, ethnic and racial groups. Milk production has been increased. New industries have been secured for some towns. Less tangible, but quite evident, too, have been changes in the work patterns of the administrators, the increased knowledge about and appreciation of the school by board members and other citizens, with an accompanying rise in the status of these administrators. Data fathered, firmly documents these accomplishments.

But what of the value of the materials gathered for use as research data?

Data collected has lent itself nicely to the building of a series of nine case studies of community efforts at self-improvements; or if written from a slightly different point of view, nine case studies of school administrators and their community relations. It is true, too, that nine case studies are here available on the community matrices within which school administrators work.

It must be admitted at once that these data lack comparability. Diversity of community size, structure, history and other characteristics were deliberately chosen so that these communities would approach a true cross-section of the communities of the state. Further diversity was introduced, or at least encouraged, when it was insisted that each community select its own projects and prosecute them in its own fashion. But is homogeneity essential for such a study? It is trite, but true, to recall that the opinion researchers insist on including all known pertinent diversities in their universe of data; that geologists seldom, if ever, run across a pure specimen.

These scholars work with data "in the raw", extracting from their masses of observation those elements which seem to them pertinent. Uncontrolled observation as here outlined is a deliberate attempt to get at such "raw data", with a minimum contamination from outside sources.

True it is, also, that no steps were taken toward setting up controls. No surveys were made of comparable communities which were then left alone until time for a second survey. As a result, we cannot say with assurance that changes observed in these nine communities have resulted from the programs initiated in them. Here we have nothing better to offer as evidence than the testimony of the school men and other citizens who say that they did such and such and got the reported changes as results.

This was seen as necessary to escape another danger. It would have been easy to have set up standard problems on which the communities would work and standard procedures for working on these problems. But to have done so would have been to destroy the freedom of action which is seen as essential to the success of this sort of research. By leaving the community as nearly free as possible, it became evident that these given communities conceived their problems to be whatever it was they chose to attack. The method of attack, then, was taken to reveal the attitudes and action patterns of that community, not those imposed by an outside authority. And it is just here that this method seems to have its value as a research technique.

Nearly always the school administrator sought guidance in selecting problems and how they might be attacked most effectively. So long as the outsider steered clear of this trap, but confined his efforts to aiding the school man in analyzing the situation, discussing alternative ways of procedure, assessing resources of the community in personnel, established practices, interested groups, power structure, and forecasting pobable outcomes in terms of such factors as these, he found himself mining a very rich vein of information on the community. The whole economy of the community, in the older sense of the term, was laid to his gaze. At least, he was given an opportunity to see the community as his informant saw it. School administrators are likely to be more aware of community factors than most because part of their jobs is to work with the community structure every day. They either understand it and work effectively within the limitations it imposes or they move on to another community and try to fit into its structure and to function according to its patterns.

These men usually do not have the protection which other community leaders have from wealth or established position. Since the livelihood of school superintendents depends on their understanding of the ways in which communities operate, the successful school administrators seek such knowledge avidly and use it adroitly. This makes them almost ideal informants. Moreover, it is easily possible to check the information from these informants against that gained from others, and to make necessary corrections based on the bias of each informant's point of view.

From this experience, I am inclined to argue that freedom to define problems is an essential to understanding those problems as they appear to the persons facing them; at least there may be room for argument as to whose definition we are using if this is not done. Further, freedom to devise ways of meeting those problems is seen as giving an excellent insight into the values and the behavior pat-

terns possessed by the actors in the situation.

But this procedure is not without disadvantages. Perhaps an "outsider" may see problems more clearly than those accustomed to living with them. It is certainly true that this method imposed the task of setting up categories after the data were collected and hereby incurred the risk of the researcher finding that he did not have sufficient data to understand a given pertinent category. In which case, he must do what the more formal researcher would have done before going into the community, father data according to his own conceptions of what is pertinent. But if he is skillful enough in getting his informants to discuss their conception of their situation, this danger is minimized.

Here, then, would seem we have a bountiful store of raw data on community life, and a better than average source to give us access to this information. But perhaps the chief value of such a program is that it takes us directly to social organization and functioning as it occurs. Here are actual specimens of community action on problems thought to be significant by the persons working at them in present-

day typical communities of this nation at this time.

Of course, neither by merely observing what is to be seen nor by setting up careful experimentation will we find answers to our fundamental questions. We must do both, judiciously mixing them according to our hunches; finding promising hypotheses from observation; testing them by controlled experimentation. And certainly my guess is that at the present we do not have a set of tested working hypotheses covering the universe of social data which makes astute observation of raw data no longer a promising field for social scientists.

Harry Estill Moore is Project Coordinator of the Cooperative Program in Educational Administration at University of Texas at Austin, Texas.

## COLLABORATION OF SOCIAL SCIENTISTS AND SOCIAL PRACTITIONERS IN THE SOLUTION OF SOCIAL PROBLEMS

#### **Robert Cuba Jones**

Although a number of organizations have evolved in recent years to apply the findings of social science to the solution of social problems, hardly any exist as yet where social scientists and social practitioners meet together<sup>1</sup> to consider common interests and there has been in the past strong resistance to efforts to develop any such collaboration.

Since many of the early social scientists were social workers as well, the question might be asked why it was that persons working in these two fields which started out from very nearly the same source almost completely broke off relations and at times rather violently. Many difficulties would have been avoided if genuinely cooperative relations had been maintained each recognizing different objectives. However, as an effort was made to make social research more objective, a break became almost inevitable. Many of the leaders of the movement to purify social science considered the development of a profession of social work with a strong scientific base impossible, and felt that the less they had to do with solution of practical problems the better. Yet this was not universally true. Hence resulted the apparent contradiction of rejection of the possibility of scientific social work by some social scientists and attempts at close affiliation with or absorption of it on the part of others.

A considerable number of social scientists still maintain that it should not concern them whether or not findings are used or in what way. Some appear to feel that some kind of stigma rests upon the scholar who concerns himself about what practical application of the knowledge he helps develop. According to this point of view if research were oriented toward the solution of practical problems, findings would likely be influenced by an inner compulsion or outside pressure to seek information which would possess relatively immediate applicability and would be superficial and lack objectivity.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup>The social Work Research Group is tending to bring social workers and social scientists together in the evaluation of social work programmes. An effort is being made at the University of Michigan to have social work instructors and social science professors meet together to discuss certain common interests. Some social workers also showing an interest in the Society for the Study of Social Problems whose membership is mainly made up of social scientists.

Such an emphasis would also, according to this way of thinking, result in the neglect of "pure" or "basic" research which in the long run is more significant and more useful.

There is reason to believe that difficulties have been avoided by such tactics. However it is also true that support has been withheld from social science research projects because practical needs have not been straight-forwardly and courageously met. The practical usefulness of many investigations is only feebly demonstrated in a so-

ciety where value is measured in terms of utility.

In connection with this discussion of relationships between scientific research and efforts to improve human welfare, devotion to observation and study has not in itself always indicated lack of concern for the well-being of the world. Those who have engaged in direct action to improve social conditions cannot justifiably charge that those who have dedicated themselves to research or the development of social theory have per se been less concerned about improving the conditions of human living. Many of those who have devoted their lives to study have been deeply motivated by the hope that their work would be useful to mankind and have felt that the more impartial and exact they were, the more likely they were to make a contribution to the betterment of human relations.

The question might well be raised at this point as to whether complete "neutrality" or "impartiality" can ever exist in the study of human relations. Social scientists cannot expect to ever be able to completely free themselves from the influence of the cultural environment in which they live and work for they themselves will always be part of their field of observation and by their very presence affect it<sup>2</sup>. This circumstance, however, need not seriously limit the possibility of objectivity if clearly recognized and indicated. In any description or analysis of human behavior only a relatively limited number of factors can be taken into account and these must necessarily be chosen according to some value system or criteria. Such bases of selection should not be ignored but instead openly analyzed and described.

Comparatively few social scientists are able to devote themselves exclusively to research or even desire to do so. Most of them must

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup>A rather striking example of this is that of Robert Redfield, whose study of Tepoztlan, Mexico, although intended to be purely descriptive and analytical, nevertheless attracted attention to the community and profoundly influenced local activities as well as thinking about community life in general on the part of Mexican scholars. A study of social change enduced through social research might be very revealing and useful project.

do a certain amount of teaching including special lecturing, administration work and consultation with associates, experts in other fields, students and both research and action agencies. An increasing number are also participating as consultants in some action programmes. It is at times difficult to determine whether such activities should be classified as diffusion of knowledge or as its utilisation. In most instances such a differentiation would be quite artificial in any case as even research is a variety of action and as such always has some motivation even though there may be no conscious awareness of such. An audience of some kind is inevitably in mind even though the obscurity of some writing and lecturing might seem to deny this. A certain amount of self expression is also invariably involved. One only needs to compare research projects in relation to current trends of popular interest to know that they are not selected at random in a social vacuum as is sometimes claimed, for scientists are subject to the same kinds of stimulations as other persons and should be conscious of such influences and make a record of them. It is not necessary that all research be carefully planned according to apparent requirements for the advancement of knowledge or for the purpose of meeting the practical needs of the world but there is no merit in avoiding all systemization.

As has been indicated, experts on and in human relations have discredited themselves at times in the past because of their failure to establish or maintain friendly cooperation. It has appeared that their knowledge of human relations and skill in dealing with them have been so limited that they have not been able to conduct their own affairs in a rational manner and it is true that generally speaking neither social scientists nor social workers have given much attention to their own problems of organization either in relation to each other or to society as a whole. Some social psychologists, psychiatrists and even social workers have also been notoriously maladjusted in their own personal relationships. Some of the social scientists who have most prided themselves on their objectivity have possessed extremely inaccurate ideas about social practitioners. Social workers, on the other hand, have held erroneous ideas about social scientists and social science, associating them with an elementary course to which they were exposed early in their career composed of a hodge podge of "common sense" knowledge which has been called "social science" offered by an incompetent instructor with no special training in the field or else with some highly abstract essay on a very specialized subject in a social science journal whose value they have been unable to comprehend or which did not seem to relate

in any way to problems vital to them. The fact that those working in each field have been able to see some of the mistakes and short-comings of those in the other while at the same time ignoring some of their own "blind spots" is an indication of the need for greater effort at collaboration rather than for continued isolation.

Ill will rather than sympathetic understanding has frequently been created in times past by ruthless or punitive evaluations by social scientists of social work services, techniques and procedures which have indicated deficiencies in such work in the light of social science knowledge. Some practitioners still fear analytical evaluation of their work in much the same way as physicians of William Harvey's day felt threatened by his studies of the human heart and its function in relation to the circulation of the blood. Verification and acceptance of his theories were bound to force the transformation of medical practice of that day and the same is undoubtedly true of social work procedures and techniques under the impact of social science. On the other hand, it has been found that unsympathetic social scientists in a quick survey of social work programmes have failed to take into account multitudinous practical problems of human relations which confront the social workers and which make operation of a programme or service difficult or which make what might seem to be rational action impossible. Even physicians have to take into account the prejudices and superstitions of their patients.

Fortunately both social workers and social scientists have matured to the place where they can be mutually as well as self-critical. Social scientists, however, must make their findings available and understandable to social practitioners and the latter bring their problems to the attention of the former for there to be interchange. To an increasing extent both are developing so fast that it is practically impossible for such liaison work to be carried on unless special provision is made for it. If some degree of mutual appreciation does not exist, however, anyone trying to serve as go-between is likely to find himself or herself serving as a buffer between two hostile groups and even be the centre of attack of both as has indeed been the case in

more than one instance in the past.

In spite of initial conflicts and only partially developed liaison relationships, medical practitioner and biologists have made important contributions to each other's work. It would seem that similar collaboration in the social field would advance the work being done in that sphere. As a matter of fact, social scientists and social practitioners have contributed much to each other's development in the past and members of each group are beginning to admit that certain

limitations in their work have probably been due to the lack of free and open communication between them. Nevertheless even today very few persons are giving any significant amount of time to developing such cooperation or are even specifically trained for such work.

One of the reasons why misunderstandings and jealousies have developed between social scientists and social workers in the past has been the difference in status which has existed between the two. Social scientists have not only in general been more highly trained than social workers having completed work for at least one if not more graduate degrees but the majority of persons employed as social workers even up to the present time have not had any professional training at all and this could not help but affect the status of all. A relatively much greater equality exists today, however, than 25 years ago. A relatively recent development which may help change the situation has been the institution of programmes of advanced study leading to the doctor's degree in a number of schools of social work with major emphasis on strengthening the scientific background and

competence in research of the students.

Although the direct contribution of social science to the development of social work has not been particularly impressive, the increase or curtailment of social research would quickly be felt by social practitioners. One reason why social work executives have not been more strongly convinced of the value of scientific investigations and evaluation, other than statistical accounting, has been that social scientists have not devoted very much attention to the presentation of their work in terms which can be easily understood and in such form that it can be directly applied. The responsibility for developing a more active market for scientific knowledge is certainly partly that of the social scientists themselves. They could at least present part of their findings in clearer and simpler form and there is an increasing demand for such writing. The writer's experience has been that social workers engaged in actual practice welcome scientific studies which have an application to their work but that often their significance has to be interpreted to them. A greater appreciation of the objectives and problems of social workers on the part of social scientists would help to make intercommunication possible but even those who have urged the development of closer relations between the two and have openly declared their belief in the importance of such cooperation have for the most part failed to do very much in a practical way to promote interchange.

The writer who studied both social science and social work, considered in his student days to be an almost indigestible mixture, did

not find any fundamental conflict between the two except in the minds of certain provincially minded individuals and the fact that man's life is too short to matter more than one small segment of either field.

Suggestions have been made here and there of the existence of destructive feuds between social scientists and social workers but both scientific and professional literature have in general been silent about these. Even though some extremely serious situations have at times developed, these have usually only been gossiped about and discussed behind closed doors. Instead of maintaining secrecy about such conflicts these should have been forced out into the open, studied, analyzed and a real effort made to bring about more creative relationships. These difficulties, which now fortunately seem to be largely a matter of the past at least in their grossest form, should be carefully examined so as to avoid future repetition of them if at all possible even though the strong vested interests responsible for them oppose their being studied.

A limited number of recognized social scientists and social workers have engaged in both social research and social work but there has been very little systematic evaluation of their experience. Special provision needs to be made for such a study because the extremely crowded programmes of most of those who are engaged in interdisciplinary work unfortunately has prevented most of them from even keeping records of their labor much less taking time to analyze the way in which the different kinds of work they have performed have influenced each other. The pressure to specialize has been extremely strong upon such generalists but perhaps this situation will change as the possibilities of teamwork in both research and action programmes are being realized. The writer can testify as to the increasing difficulty as well as expensiveness of even attempting to keep well informed regarding developments in both social science and social work both of which are increasing rapidly in complexity of subject matter as well as of organization. Collaboration between specialists will make possible even greater division of labor and at the same time a more integrated approach. The experiments which have been made so far in cooperative research have shown, however, that it is not sufficient to simply employ experts to work together. Knowledge of group processes and training in democratic group relations are particularly important until such time as adequate security and proper incentive can be offered to maintain teamwork.

Robert Cuba Jones has been a staff member of the U.N. From October 1951 until March 1953 he was a Community Development officer.

